DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 745 CS 502 386

AUTHOR Nyquist, Jody L.
TITLE The Status of Speech Communication in High Schools in the State of Washington: A Comparison with Michigan in 1976 and Washington in 1966.
PUB DATE Nov 78
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (64th, Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 2-5, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *Curriculum Research; *School Surveys; Secondary Education; *Speech Communication; *Speech Curriculum; Speech Education; Speech Instruction; State Surveys; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Michigan; *Washington

ABSTRACT

Principals from 246 high schools in Washington state responded to a questionnaire survey of the speech communication programs offered in that state's secondary schools. The 85-item questionnaire elicited information on the basic course offerings, advanced courses, extracurricular speech communication activities, and the training and experience of those teaching the courses. The results were compared to a 1975-1976 Michigan state study to assess differences and similarities in the two states' programs and to a 1966 Washington state study to identify growth or deterioration of programs. The findings indicated that the status of speech communication programs in Washington high schools was better than it had been in 1966 and compared favorably with Michigan in terms of basic and advanced courses and extracurricular activities. In Washington, however, speech communication programs were being taught by teachers not trained in speech communication. The majority of those teaching the courses did not hold undergraduate degrees in speech communication, were not enrolled in speech communication departments for graduate work, and were not active in speech communication professional organizations. (FI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED166745

The Status of Speech Communication in High Schools in the State of Washington: A Comparison with Michigan in 1976 and Washington in 1966

Jody L. Nyquist
Lecturer
Department of Speech Communication
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Jody L. Nyquist

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

This survey of the speech communication programs in the high schools of the state of Washington identifies the kinds of basic courses, advanced courses, and extracurricular speech communication activities currently offered and describes the training and experience of the instructors teaching the courses. The results are compared to a 1975-76 Michigan State Study to assess differences/similarities between the two states and to a 1966 Washington State Study to identify growth or deterioration of programs.

CS502386

The Status of Speech Communication in High Schools in the State of Washington: A Comparison with Michigan in 1976 and Washington in 1966

Continuous questioning from undergraduate speech communication education majors concerning secondary speech communication curricula, job availability, and appropriate university preparation for teaching at that level prompted this study in an effort to assess the status of speech communication in the high schools of the state of Washington. The researcher believed that a variety of factors had affected speech communication curriculums and teacher preparation programs. These include the national "Back to Basics Movement" in education, the Washington State Legislature's attempt to define the basics and thus allocate funding on that basis, the Ryan Act in California,[1] and societal attitudes toward education in general. This study seeks to determine the impact of these factors and others on the high schools of the state of Washington.

By comparing Washington's offerings with the 1975-76 Michigan state study,[2] it is possible to assess how well Washington is faring in relation to a mid-western state well known for its commitment to speech communication. In addition, to trace possible growth or deterioration of programs in Washington, selected current findings were compared to available findings of the last Washington state study completed in 1966.[3] This study, therefore, attempts to answer three questions: 1) What is the present status of speech communication programs in Washington high schools in terms of curriculum and teacher preparation? 2) How do current speech communication programs in the high schools of Washington compare to those offered in Michigan? 3) Is there evidence of growth or

deterioration in Washington speech communication programs since 1966?

Procedures

Questionnaires addressed to principals[4] were mailed out in the spring of 1977 and yielded a return from 246 of the state's 302 public and private high schools (81.2 percent) by August. The questionnaire consisted of 85 items requesting information on basic course offerings, advanced courses, extracurricular speech communication activities, and the academic preparation and experience of those teaching the courses. The questionnaire was designed to match Michigan's state study to provide maximum comparison possibilities. The data was analyzed with frequency count and cross tabulation programs[5] to answer the three research questions.

The Results

The respondents identified speech communication programs in 220 schools or 72.6 percent of Washington's high schools. In comparison, the Michigan study reported speech communication programs in 549 schools representing 75 percent of the state's high schools,[6] a figure very similar to Washington's. The 1966 Washington study reported programs in 160 or 56.3 percent[7] of the state's high schools. Comparison with the current study indicates a 16.3 percent growth of speech communication programs since 1966.

To make further comparisons of the programs, the researcher chose to focus on the similarities/differences of 15 key items concerned with curriculum and teacher preparation. In each case, the results of the present study are reported by the percentage of the schools responding to the questionnaire, compared to the Michigan study, and finally compared with the results of the 1966 Washington study whenever the information is available.

Descriptions of Basic Course

This study asked respondents to describe their basic course as primarily focusing on (1) public speaking, (2) interpersonal communication, (3) fundamentals, (4) combination of the above, or (5) other (briefly describe). As indicated in Table 1, the majority (69.5 percent) of the 1977 respondents identified their courses as combination courses. The 1975-76 Michigan Study showed similar findings with percentages slightly less in the public speaking and slightly more in the interpersonal communication categories:[8]

Insert Table 1

The 1966 Washington state study did not ask for a description of the basic course. A second questionnaire was mailed to those teachers who indicated on the initial questionnaire that they were willing to provide additional information. Fifty people or 12 percent of the total number of schools responded to this second request. These respondents were not asked to differentiate between basic and advanced level courses. Of the 50 respondents, 20 or 37 percent reported a Beginning Speech Course, 2 or .04 percent reported a Speech Arts course, 19 or 35 percent reported a Public Speaking course, and 13 or 24 percent reported a Forensics course.[9] Comparison of these findings with the 1977 results listed in Table 1 suggests some movement away from a public speaking emphasis at the basic level and the addition of limited offerings of interpersonal communication. The Michigan study identified a similar trend.[10]

Length of Basic Course

The 1977 basic course taught in Washington is of shorter duration than the semester or year course more typical of the high school setting. The

combined year and semester offerings, once the only format used, account for only 59.9 percent of the 1977 offerings. As indicated in Table 2, 22.6 percent of the courses are currently offered in the trimester format and 10.8 percent are scheduled on a quarterly basis. This change is not reflected in the Michigan study where semester or year offerings account for 87.9 percent of the courses offered.[11] This suggests that Washington programs provide more variation in course length. It may also imply that Washington students spend less time (fewer class sessions) in speech communication courses than Michigan students. Statistics on course length were not available from the 1966 data.

Insert Table 2

Class Size

Comparison of 1977 Washington class sizes with those of the 1975-76 Michigan findings reveals that Washington classes are slightly smaller. Washington's classes range from a size of 5 students upwards to 50, with a mean of 20 students per class. Michigan reports a slightly smaller range of 2 to 42 students with a mean of 24 students per section.[12] While 85 percent of the Michigan respondents reported classes of 20 or more students, only 74 percent of Washington's respondents indicated classes of 20 or more students.

Comparison of class size of speech communication courses with those eleven years ago is difficult since the Washington 1966 data is based solely upon the 50 responses to the second questionnaire as explained previously, and there exists no way to determine how representative those responses were. Of those reporting, 78 percent indicated a class size of 20 or more students,

similar to the Washington 1977 findings.[13]

Speech Communication as a Requirement

The current study indicates that 76 (36.4 percent) of the respondents require a basic course in speech communication for high school graduation. Michigan's respondents reported 182 schools (34.6 percent)[14] requiring speech communication. It is apparent that in both states, speech communication courses are predominately elective rather than required.

The 1966 Washington study reported that of the 50 schools sampled via the second questionnaire, only 9 percent[15] of those respondents required a speech course of any kind.

Textbook

Textbook choices provided by the respondents to the Washington 1977 study tend to include the older texts as reflected in the titles listed in Table 3. While 50 different titles were identified by the respondents as used in the basic course, only four were mentioned by more than ten teachers. Table 3 displays a rank ordering of the five leading textbooks in Washington in 1977, and the eight leading texts in Michigan in 1975-76.[16] Other books listed had fewer than seven schools using each book.

Insert Table 3

While some differences in ordering appear, the textbook usage between the two states appears quite similar. The major difference is that 53.6 percent of Washington's respondents use no text as compared to 29.4 percent

of Michigan's.

Rank ordering by number of teachers using the text indicates that the text most often used in Washington in 1977 is the same as that most often used in 1966: 38 Basic Speech Experiences by Carlisle. The textbook ranked second also remains the same--The New American Speech by Hedde and Brigance. The text ranking third in the 1966 study, Speech in Action by Robinson and Lee,[17] appears sixth in the 1977 ranking.

Summary

A basic course in speech communication was taught in 72.6 percent of the high schools in the state of Washington during 1977. The course tended to be primarily a fundamentals course taught in semester or trimester units, comprised of approximately 20 students per class, and offered on an elective basis. Over half of the classes did not use textbooks at all, and the remaining classes reported infrequent use of them.

A comparison of Washington programs with those in Michigan reveals (1) a similar percentage of programs offered, (2) slightly more emphasis on interpersonal communication in Michigan, (3) more varied course duration in Washington, (4) slightly longer classes in Michigan, and (5) some differences in textbook usage between the two states.[18]

Changes in Washington's programs since the 1966 study include a 16.3 percent increase in the number of programs offered, the addition of limited offerings in interpersonal communication, and a significant increase in the number of schools requiring speech communication for high school graduation.

Advanced Courses in Speech Communication

Speech Communication classes offered beyond the basic course reported in

the Washington 1977 data consisted of sections of Drama, Debate, Advanced Speech, Radio/T.V., Film, Interpersonal Communication, and Discussion. Table 4 shows a comparison of the Washington 1977 study with the Michigan[19] and the Washington 1966 findings:[20]

Insert Table 4

More than half of the state's high schools (170) currently offer a drama course, nearly one-third of the schools (96) offer a debate course, and one-sixth of the schools (55) offer an advanced speech course.

As indicated, some differences appear between the offerings reported by the two more recent studies. Washington respondents reported a higher percentage of Drama classes (77.6 percent to Michigan's 68.0 percent). Conversely, Michigan respondents reported higher percentages in all other advanced speech communication courses.

A comparison of 1977 data with the 1966 findings reveals a tremendous change in the number and variety of advanced course offerings, and a heavier emphasis on drama assuming the 1966 data is representative.

Extracurricular Activities

The most popular speech communication extracurricular activities in Washington in 1977 are Drama or Theatre, Debate, and Individual Forensics as indicated in Table 5.

Insert Table 5

Comparison with Michigan reveals that Michigan respondents offer slightly more Drama and Forensics (Individual Events) but slightly fewer Debate activities than Washington.[21] Overall, the offerings are quite similar. The Washington 1966 study indicated fewer extracurricular activities in the schools sampled[22] and would point to growth in the last ten years.

Summary

In every category used to measure the basic course, there appear to be only slight differences between Washington and Michigan. A comparison of advanced speech communication courses indicates that a slightly higher percentage of Michigan high schools offer advanced courses than do schools in Washington. Extracurricular activities reported reflect very similar offerings by both states.

The results of these findings indicate that Washington speech communication programs are faring about as well as Michigan's and have indeed grown since 1966. While the growth has not been spectacular, the findings do not show evidence of the drastic cutbacks feared by those involved in teacher preparation and assumed by many members of the Washington State Speech Association. The findings show, instead, that there are now speech communication programs in 72.6 percent of Washington's high schools, stronger advanced speech communication offerings, and significantly more extracurricular speech communication activities than ten years ago.

The Teachers

The findings detailing the kinds of speech communication courses taught in Washington's high schools led to questions about the instructors teaching the courses. Who are they? What kind of academic preparation have they obtained?

How do they keep current about the speech communication disciplines? Again, the researcher sought to compare the 1977 reports of teacher preparation and teaching experience with those reported in the 1975-76 Michigan and 1966 Washington studies.

Undergraduate degrees. Most of the speech communication teachers (82 percent) obtained their undergraduate degrees from Washington public or private institutions, primarily the University of Washington (16.9 percent), Western Washington University (11.6 percent), Washington State University (11.1 percent), and Eastern Washington University (10.1 percent). Only 17.9 percent reported preparation in out-of-state institutions.

The Michigan study reported similar results with fewer than 20 percent of the teachers completing their undergraduate work in out-of-state institutions.[23] The 1966 Washington study reported that 71 percent of the teachers had received their degrees from Washington teacher training institutions and 29 percent from out-of-state colleges and universities.[24] This indicates that currently 11 percent more of the speech communication teachers in Washington have been trained in Washington state institutions than eleven years ago.

By 1977, 100 percent of the respondents held bachelor's degrees granted as early as 1937 and as recently as the year of the survey, 1977. Table 6 shows that Michigan's study reported similar findings in terms of the years in which the respondents received bachelor's degrees.[25]

Insert Table 6

In 1966 only 76 percent of the respondents (based on the initial questionnaire which recorded a 65 percent return from the state's then 281 high schools)

held bachelor's degrees.[26] The year granted was not specified.

Fifth Year Requirement. In the state of Washington, a fifth year of college or university is required to complete the requirements for the Standard Teaching Certificate. This requirement consists of 45 credits beyond the B.A. including some courses prescribed by departments in which the teacher obtained her/his undergraduate degree and the college or department of Education, or the requirement may be combined with a master's degree program.

Most of the teachers (89.1 percent) reported completing their fifth year work at one of the state's public or private institutions, primarily the University of Washington (24.6 percent), Eastern Washington University (12.0 percent), Western Washington University (11.4 percent) and Central Washington University (10.9 percent). Michigan does not require a Fifth Year program certification, and the Washington 1966 study did not report information on the Fifth Year Requirement.

Graduate Work. In 1977, 30.5 percent of the respondents held Master's Degrees or had completed work beyond the Master's level, and another 31.4 percent of the respondents were actively pursuing a Master's Degree. These figures are slightly lower than in Michigan's where 35 percent of the respondents held Master's Degrees or had completed work beyond the Master's level and another 47 percent were involved in Master's Degree programs.[27] In 1966, only 21 percent of the respondents held Master's Degrees.[28]

As in the case in Michigan, the universities accounting for the majority of the respondents' undergraduate preparation in Washington also provided the majority of the graduate study undertaken by the respondents. Washington returns showed a larger number (22.7 percent) of respondents enrolling for graduate work in out of state institutions than Michigan's.

Comparisons of granting institutions and degrees in the present study

indicate that the majority of the respondents attended state supported schools for their undergraduate, fifth year, and graduate programs.

Majors and Minors

Teacher candidates in the state of Washington must meet the requirements of the particular granting institution in terms of majors and minors, and there exist varying programs of study. All must, however, complete a teaching major appropriate for secondary level.

At the undergraduate level, the respondents identified 13 distinct majors representing such varied backgrounds as physical education, biological science, music, geography, English, drama, and social studies. Tables 7 and 8 include lists of the most predominant undergraduate major and minor areas identified by the respondents. As shown, speech communication and/or English accounted for 63.2 percent of the respondents' majors while drama and social studies appear most often listed as second majors.

Only 27.3 percent of the Washington respondents listed speech communication as their undergraduate first major in comparison to Michigan's 48 percent.[29] The most important finding is that a higher percentage of the respondents teaching speech communication courses in 1977 majored in English than in speech communication.

Insert Table 7

The Washington 1966 study listed 26 percent of the respondents identifying speech as their undergraduate major.[30] No information on majors other than speech was requested.

Insert Table 8

The predominant minor designated by Washington respondents was neither English nor speech but social studies. This does not hold true for Michigan where English represents the predominant minor followed by speech and social studies.[31] In 1966 46 percent of the respondents listed speech as a minor.[32] Additional information was not requested.

Graduate majors and minors reported by the respondents followed the same trend. As indicated in Table 9, the predominant graduate major is English, almost double the number of speech communication majors. The few minors reported may be at the doctoral level since minor areas of concentration are usually not required at the master's level. The most frequently mentioned majors identified by Michigan respondents were speech or speech related subjects including drama and communication accounting for 40 percent of their graduate majors.[33]

Insert Table 9

Summary

In summary, only 42.4 percent of the respondents identified speech communication as a first major or minor at the undergraduate level in 1977. This finding may suggest that while programs now exist in 72.6 percent of Washington's high schools, the courses are not being taught by people primarily trained to do so. The data suggests that students returning for graduate degrees prefer English or Education rather than Speech Communication.

Michigan, in comparison, reported 60 percent of the respondents identifying speech communication as a major or minor.[34] Washington appears to have more teachers primarily trained in English teaching speech communication than Michigan.

When compared to the 1966 findings, Washington currently has a lower percentage of teachers with a major or minor in speech communication teaching speech communication courses.

Teaching Experience

To identify further the teachers teaching speech communication in the state of Washington, respondents were asked to report the number of years they had been teaching. Fifty-six percent of the respondents had taught from one to five years, and only 17.3 percent identified more than ten years of teaching experience. Fifty-one percent reported having directed speech activities for five years or less, and only 17.5 percent identified having more than ten years experience in directing forensics programs.

Michigan respondents reported slightly more teaching experience. Those with less than five years of experience comprised 49 percent of the total, and those with ten years or more equaled 19 percent.[35] Forty-five percent of the Michigan respondents reported having directed speech activities for five years or less and 24 percent directed longer than ten years.[36]

In 1966, 48 percent of the teachers had taught five years or less. Additional experience information was not requested.[37]

Professional Affiliation

Respondents to the Washington 1977 study reflected very limited activity in terms of professional organizations. The strongest commitments were to the

National Council of Teachers of English and the Washington Debate Coaches Association and not to any of the speech communication associations.

Michigan's findings indicate that more than twice as many of their teachers are involved at the state level with the Michigan Speech Association.[38] Comparisons are represented in Table 10.

Insert Table 10

Again, this information was not requested in the 1966 study so that comparison of the 11 intervening years cannot be made.

Summary

Basically, the majority of the speech communication teachers in Washington in 1977 graduated since 1960 from one of the state's universities, majored in English or speech communication, returned to the same institution for fifth year or graduate work primarily in English or education, have taught less than five years, and are not active in speech communication professional organizations.[39] This is not the profile normally expected of speech communication teachers.

Conclusions

The status of speech communication programs in the high schools of the state of Washington is better than it was ten years ago and compares favorably with Michigan in terms of basic and advanced courses and extracurricular activities. More schools are currently requiring a speech communication course for high school graduation. While Washington's and Michigan's current programs are very similar, Michigan's programs have shown very little development and growth

over the last ten years in spite of major changes in knowledge and technology.[40] This means that both states need updating in terms of materials and methods for teaching speech communication.

In Washington, however, these speech communication programs are being taught by teachers not trained in speech communication. Since the majority of those currently teaching the courses do not hold undergraduate degrees in speech communication, are not enrolling in speech communication departments for graduate work, and are not active in speech communication professional organizations, their knowledge of the field is likely to be deficient in terms of current research. The dated textbook choices and limited offerings of advanced speech communication courses may be evidence of inadequate exposure to the field.

Implications

Members of the discipline of speech communication in the state of Washington, therefore, need to work together to educate students, superintendents, principals, and teachers of other disciplines of the necessity for speech communication trained teachers to teach speech communication courses.

Specifically, college, university and high school teachers of speech communication should undertake to:

1. Insure that all teachers teaching speech communication be required to have some formal training in speech communication.
2. Offer in-service training programs for the teachers currently teaching speech communication in an effort to update and improve their teaching competencies.
3. Develop a program for training undergraduate speech communication students and speech trained teachers to become change agents out in the high schools to inform administration and teachers of other disciplines about speech communication.

4. Recruit undergraduates of speech communication programs to return to speech communication departments for fifth year and graduate training by offering programs responsive to their needs as high school teachers.

5. Actively recruit teachers teaching speech communication into the state professional organization to enable them to keep current with the latest developments in the field.

6. Collaborate with English departments and colleges of education to develop minors in cognate areas in speech communication to adequately prepare students to teach at least a basic course in speech communication.

7. Present workshops and programs at National Council of Teacher of English Conferences to reach teachers currently teaching speech communication who have had little or no formal training.

There are still many unanswered questions concerning the teachers of speech communication courses in Washington high schools. Where are they obtaining whatever training they are getting? Why are they not seeking work in speech communication when they are teaching the courses? Are the available speech communication programs beyond the bachelor's degree not responsive to their needs? Are English and education programs providing training in speech communication?

The speech communication discipline in the state of Washington needs to seriously seek answers to these questions and recommendations so that a 1987 study will not show a continued growth of speech communication programs taught exclusively by teachers trained in disciplines other than speech communication. Properly trained speech communication teachers will develop strong and vital high school programs. The training of current and prospective speech communication teachers should be the first concern of the discipline in this state.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Robert D. Kully, "Speech Communication Programs and Political Actions: California's Credential Legislation: Back to Basics Movement," California Speech Association Newsletter 7 (February 1978), p. 4-17.

[2]Cassandra L. Book and Edward J. Pappas, "The Status of Speech Communication in Michigan Secondary Schools," Manuscript submitted to Central States Speech Journal, to be published Fall 1978.

[3]Remo P. Fausti and Robert W. Vogelsang, "The Status: In High Schools of the State of Washington," Speech Teacher, 18 (January 1969), p. 50-53, and Frederick Neil Hogg, A Survey of Speech and Drama in the Secondary Schools of the State of Washington 1965-66, Unpublished Master's Thesis, Washington State University, 1968. Original materials from the 1966 study were provided the researcher by Remo Fausti of Washington State University.

[4]Mailing labels were provided by the State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

[5]Norman H. Nie, C. Hadlai Hull, Jean G. Jenkins, Karin Steinbrenner, Dale H. Bent, Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975). Collection and coding of data were accomplished through the cooperative efforts of Don Boileau and Stella Ting-Toomey.

[6]Book and Pappas, p. 2.

[7]Hogg, p. 35.

[8]Book and Pappas, p. 5.

[9]Fausti and Vogelsang, p. 52.

[10]Book and Pappas, p. 5.

[11]Book and Pappas, p. 2.

[12]Book and Pappas, p. 4.

[13]Percentage taken from original responses to second questionnaire administered in February 1967 and provided the researcher by Remo Fausti.

[14]Book and Pappas, p. 4.

[15]Again, the percentage was taken from the second questionnaire administered in 1967 and provided the researcher by Remo Fausti.

[16]Book and Pappas, p. 6.

[17]Hogg, p. 40.

[18]Publication limitations prevent the complete reporting of additional information concerning class session length, grade level, frequency of offerings, additional textbook information, means of evaluation of student performance, and class designations of schools offering programs. This information is available upon request from the author.

[19]Book and Pappas, p. 8.

[20]Percentages taken from original responses to second questionnaire administered in February 1967 and provided the researcher by Remo Fausti.

[21]Book and Pappas, p. 9.

[22]Again the percentage was taken from the second questionnaire administered by Remo Fausti in February 1967 and provided the researcher.

[23]Book and Pappas, p. 11.

[24]Fausti and Vogelsang, p. 50.

[25]Book and Pappas, p. 12.

[26]Fausti and Vogelsang, p. 50.

[27]Book and Pappas, p. 12.

[28]Fausti and Vogelsang, p. 50.

[29]Book and Pappas, p. 14.

[30]Again, the percentage was taken from the second questionnaire administered by Remo Fausti in February 1967 and provided the researcher.

[31]Book and Pappas, p. 14.

[32]Again, the percentage was taken from the second questionnaire administered by Remo Fausti in February 1967 and provided the researcher.

[33]Book and Pappas, p. 15.

[34]Book and Pappas, p. 14.

[35]Book and Pappas, p. 16.

[36]Book and Pappas, p. 16.

[37]Fausti and Vogelsang, p. 50.

[38]Book and Pappas, p. 17.

[39]Additional information of year of completion of graduate work, current course loads of respondents, non-speech courses currently taught by respondents, numbers of speech communication trained teachers in the various schools is available upon request from the author.

[40]Book and Pappas, p. 20.

Table 1

Description of the Basic Course

Description	1977 Washington		1975-76 Michigan	
	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools Responding	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools Responding
Public Speaking	48	22.5	100	18.6
Interpersonal Communication	5	2.3	30	5.6
Fundamentals/Activities	8	3.8	6	1.1
Combination	148	69.5	388	72.1
Other	4	1.9	14	2.6
No Answer	7		11	

Table 2

Length of the Basic Course

Length	1977 Washington		1975-76 Michigan	
	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools
Semester	100	47.2	385	71.4
Year	27	12.7	89	16.5
Trimester	48	22.6		
Quarter	23	10.8		
Other	14	6.6	65	12.1
No Answer	8		10	

Table 3

Textbooks in Basic Courses

Textbook	1977 Washington		Textbook	1975-76 Michigan	
	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools		Number of Schools	Percent of Schools
1. Carlisle *38 Basic Speech Experiences*	19	12.4	1. Hedde, Brigance & Powell *New American Speech* ('68)	56	16.3
2. Hedde, Brigance & Powell *New American Speech*	11	5.3	2. Elson & Peck *Art of Speaking* ('66)	50	14.5
3. Irwin & Rosenberger *Modern Speech*	10	4.8	3. Carlisle *38 Basic Speech Experiences* ('69)	47	13.7
4. Elson & Peck *Art of Speaking*	50	3.8	4. Galvin & Book *Person to Person* ('74)	34	9.9
5. Galvin & Book *Person to Person*	7	3.3	5. Robinson & Lee *Speech in Action* ('65)	28	8.1
6. Robinson & Lee *Speech in Action*	6	2.9	6. Buys *Speaking by Doing* ('67)	17	4.9
			7. Irwin & Rosenberger *Modern Speech* ('67)	14	4.1
			8. Hibbs *Speech for Today* ('65)	14	4.1
No textbook	112	53.6	No textbook	154	29.4

Table 4

Other Speech Communication Courses Offered

	1977 Washington		1975-76 Michigan		1966 Washington	
	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools
Drama	170	77.6	367	68.0	8	16
Debate	96	43.8	244	45.2	9	18
Advanced Speech	55	25.1	198	36.7	7	14
Radio/T.V.	34	15.5	121	22.4		
Film	34	15.5	82	15.2		
Oral Interp.	27	12.3	125	23.1	3	.06
Interpersonal Communication	18	8.3	57	10.6		
Discussion	11	5.0	67	12.4		

Table 5

Extracurricular Activities

	1977 Washington		1975-76 Michigan		1966 Washington	
	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools	Number of Schools	Percent of Schools
Drama (Theatre)	154	72.0	427	77.8	20	40
Debate	107	50.2	251	45.7	21	42
Forensics (Individual Events)	104	48.6	306	55.7	9	18

Table 6

Year in Which Bachelor's Degree Was Granted

Years of Graduation	1977 Washington		1975-76 Michigan	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1933-1939	2	1.0	3	0.6
1940-1949	17	8.3	25	5.0
1950-1959	32	15.7	81	16.0
1960-1969	73	35.8	190	37.0
1970-1975	74	36.3	216	42.0
1976-1977	6	2.9		
No answer	16			

Table 7

Predominant Undergraduate Majors of Respondents

	1977 Washington				1975-76 Michigan			
	Major 1		Major 2		Major 1		Major 2	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
English	75	35.9	16	16	160	29	54	10
Speech/Speech Communication	57	27.3	12	12	266	48	40	8
Social Studies	30	14.4	23	23	27	5	23	4
Communications	2	1.0	1	1				
Drama	8	3.8	26	26	25	4	64	12
Other	35	16.7	21	21				

Table 8

Predominant Undergraduate Minors of Respondents

	1977 Washington				1975-76 Michigan			
	Minor 1		Minor 2		Minor 1		Minor 2	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Social Studies	57	31.8	18	29	86	15	61	11
English	54	30.2	10	16.1	185	34	16	3
Speech	27	15.1	10	16.1	95	17	10	2
Drama	9	5.0	0	0	26	5	21	4
Communications	1	.5	2	3.2	0	0	0	0
Other	30	16.8	22	35.5				

Table 9

Predominate Graduate Majors and Minors

1977 Washington

	Major 1		Major 2		Minor 1		Minor 2	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
English	19	28.8	7	35	4	15.4	4	44.4
Education	13	19.7	4	20	5	19.2	0	0
Speech	10	15.2	2	10	2	7.7	0	0
Social Studies	5	7.6	2	10	5	19.2	5	33.3
Drama	4	6.1	2	10	0	0	2	22.2
Communication	3	1.4	0	0	2	7.7	0	0